		F-FILING
	**	APO
1	Tammy Hussin (Bar No. 155290)	APR 2 9 2013
2	Tammy Hussin (Bar No. 155290)  Lemberg & Associates, Lac	ern Disi Distribution
3	6404 Merlin Drive	San Jose California
4	Carlsbad, CA 92011 Telephone (855) 301-2100 ext. 5514	San Jose California 2921
π.	thussin@lemberglaw.com	7eg
5	Lambora & Associates II.C	*39
6	Lemberg & Associates, LLC 1100 Summer Street	99
7	Stamford, CT 06905	
8	Telephone: (203) 653-2250	
9	Facsimile: (203) 653-3424	. /
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff,	
11	Fabian Hernandez	
12	i	
13	LINUTED OF A TIPO	Didministration of the second
14		DISTRICT COURT
15		ICT OF CALIFORNIA
16	Fabian Hernandez,	123 No. 01948 PSG
17	Plaintiff,	54200 (2000) (CONTRACTOR 60 (CONTRACTOR CO. )
18	VS.	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES  1. VIOLATION OF FAIR DEBT
		COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 ET. SEQ; 2. VIOLATION OF FAIR DEBT
19	Roquemore & Roquemore, Inc.; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	COLLECTION OF FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRATICES ACT, CAL.CIV.CODE § 1788 ET. SEQ.
20	Defendants.	
21		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	<u></u>	
		COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Fabian Hernandez, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

#### **JURISDICTION**

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
  - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendants transact business here and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred here.

### **PARTIES**

- 4. The Plaintiff, Fabian Hernandez (hereafter "Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in King City, California, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 5. Defendant Roquemore & Roquemore, Inc. ("Roquemore"), is a Texas business entity with an address of P.O. Box 743608, Dallas, Texas 75374-3608, operating; as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by

  Roquemore and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more

  of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through

  discovery.
- 7. Roquemore at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

#### **ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

### A. The Debt

- 8. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to an original creditor (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Roquemore for collection, or Roquemore was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

### B. Roquemore Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Within the last year, Roquemore contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

- 13. During the initial conversation and during most conversations thereafter, Roquemore failed to identify itself to Plaintiff and failed to inform Plaintiff that the call was an attempt to collect the Debt and all information obtained would be used for that purpose.
- 14. Roquemore called Plaintiff at his place of employment in an attempt to collect the Debt.
- 15. Plaintiff advised Roquemore that the calls to his work place were prohibited by policy of his employer and requested that no further calls be placed to Plaintiff's place of employment.
- 16. Despite having been so informed, Roquemore continued calling Plaintiff at his place of employment up to three times per day on a daily basis. These calls caused a great deal of distress and fear for his job to Plaintiff.
- 17. During one calls to Plaintiff's workplace, Roquemore disclosed the existence of the Debt to Plaintiff's employer, causing humiliation to Plaintiff.

  Roquemore offered to pay Plaintiff's employer to take the vehicle away from Plaintiff.
- 18. Roquemore used bullying tactics during conversations with Plaintiff, often times yelling at him in an effort to intimidate Plaintiff into making an immediate payment.
- 19. On one occasion, Plaintiff's nine-year-old son answered a call from Roquemore. Plaintiff's son informed Roquemore that his father was not at home.

Roquemore proceeded to yell at the child, calling him a "liar" and demanding that he hand the phone to Plaintiff immediately.

- 20. Roquemore also made several calls to Plaintiff's cousin, stating that the calls were regarding an "urgent matter."
- 21. Roquemore called Plaintiff's counsin for purposes other than Plaintiff's location information, as it already had spoken with Plaintiff and knew his location information.
- 22. Roquemore called Plaintiff's cousin on several occasions, despite her requests to cease calling her.

# VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

- 23. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 24. The Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at his place of employment, knowing that the Plaintiff's employer prohibited such communications, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(3).
- 25. The Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b).

- 26. The Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d.
- 27. The Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5).
- 28. The Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6).
- 29. The Defendants failed to inform the consumer that the communication was an attempt to collect a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11).
- 30. The Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
- 31. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
- 32. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

# <u>COUNT II</u> <u>VIOLATION OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION</u> PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788 et seq.

- 33. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 34. The Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil Code section 1788 et seq. ("Rosenthal Act") prohibits unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.
- 35. Roquemore & Roquemore, Inc., in the regular course of business, engages in debt collection and is a "debt collector" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).
- 36. The Defendants caused a telephone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in continuous conversations with an intent to annoy the Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(d).
- 37. The Defendants failed to comply with the provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.13(e).
- 38. The Defendants communicated with the Plaintiff's employer about the Plaintiff's debt, without consent of the Plaintiff's attorney or the Plaintiff, and without the purpose of verifying location or employment information, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.12(a).

- 39. The Defendants communicated information about the debt to the Plaintiff's extended family, without the intent of confirming the Plaintiff's location and without consent from the Plaintiff or the Plaintiff's attorney, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.12(b).
- 40. The Defendants did not comply with the provisions of Title 15, Section 1692 of the United States Code, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- 41. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

### COUNT III INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

- 42. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 43. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652B defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."
- 44. California further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus the Defendants violated California state law.
- 45. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing Plaintiff with the above referenced telephone calls.

- 46. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652B requirement for an invasion of privacy.
- 47. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.
- 48. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.
- 49. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

## COUNT IV INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 50. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.
- 51. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants vis-à-vis the Plaintiff was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

- 52. The foregoing conduct constitutes the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the State of California.
- 53. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.
- 54. Defendants could reasonably foresee its conduct would cause mental anguish and severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.
- 55. Plaintiff did indeed suffer mental anguish and severe emotional distress including post-traumatic stress, paranoia, and depression.
- 56. Defendant's conduct resulted in reckless infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the State of California.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

- A. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
- B. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
- C. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C.§ 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendants;

1		D. Actual damage	es pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);				
3		E. Statutory dama	ages of \$1,000.00 for knowingly and willfully committing				
4		violations purs	uant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);				
5		F. Actual damage	es from the Defendants for the all damages including				
6 7		emotional distr	ress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or				
8	negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligen						
9		invasions of pr	ivacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the				
10 11		Plaintiff;					
12		G. Punitive damaş	ges; and				
13		H. Such other and	further relief as may be just and proper.				
14		,	The second second of the property				
15		TRIAL BY JU	JRY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS				
16							
17							
18 19	DATED:	April 23, 2013	TAMMY HUSSIN				
20							
21			By: /s/ Tammy Hussin Tammy Hussin, Esq.				
22			Lemberg & Associates, LLC				
23			Attorney for Plaintiff Fabian Hernandez				
24   25							
26							
27							
28							
- 11			11 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES				

JS 44 CAND (Rev. 12/11)

### CIVIL COVER SHEET

E-FILING

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
Fabian Hernandez				Roquemore & Roquemore, Inc.						
	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Monterey	/	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant State of Texas						
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				NOTE:	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
(c) Attomeys (Firm Name, Tammy Hussin, 6404 Me ext. 5514; of counsel to l Street, Third Floor, Stam	Lemberg & Associates ford, CT 06905; (203)	, LLC, 1100 Summ 653-2250	er	Attorneys (If Known	*				ı	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	TCTION (Place an "X"	' in One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES				
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff  ### 3Federal Question  U.S. Government Not a Party)				(For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF DEF  PTF DEF  Citizen of This State  I I Incorporated or Principal Place						
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State			O 5	<b>5</b>			
	8			en or Subject of a (	O 3 O 3	Foreign Nation		<b>o</b> 6	□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		Only)								
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	Y 🗆 625	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	☐ 422 Appea☐ 423 Withd	KRUPTCY al 28 USC 158 brawal SC 157	☐ 375 False Cl☐ 400 State Re☐ 410 Antitrus	apportion		
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment		Liability			PROPERTY RIGHTS				-	
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	999 2002	LABOR	830 Patent					
<ul> <li>☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits</li> </ul>	Liability  350 Motor Vehicle  355 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending	☐ 720	D Fair Labor Standards Act D Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 861 HIA (1 ☐ 862 Black ☐ 863 DIWC	1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	850 Securitie Exchang	es/Commod ge		
☐ 190 Other Contract☐ 195 Contract Product Liability☐ 196 Franchise	Product Liability  360 Other Personal Injury  362 Personal Injury -	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 751	) Railway Labor Act   Family and Medical   Leave Act   Other Labor Litigation	☐ 864 SSID 1 ☐ 865 RSI (4		891 Agricultu 11 893 Environt 895 Freedom	nental Mat		
REAL PROPERTY	Med. Malpractice		CJ 791	Empl. Ret. Inc.			☐ 896 Arbitrati			
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS  ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION  ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate		Security Act	FEDERAL  □ 870 Taxes	U.S. Plaintiff	□ 899 Administ	trative Proc ew or App		
<ul> <li>□ 220 Foreclosure</li> <li>□ 230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>□ 240 Torts to Land</li> </ul>	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence Habeas Corpus:  530 General			or Def □ 871 IRS—	fendant)	Agency I  950 Constitut State State	Decision tionality of		
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	Employment		IMMIGRATION  Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus -	1					
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	□ 465	Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) Other Immigration Actions						
V. ORIGIN  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  (2) 1 Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district 2 Appellete Court 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district 2 Appellete Court 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 3 Appellete Court 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 3 Appellete Court 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 3 Appellete Court 5 Transferred from 3 Appellete										
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION    Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 15 USC 1692					statutes unless d	liversity):				
			Practice	es Act						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23			DE 25,000	MAND \$ 0.00		ECK YES only i RY DEMAND:		omplaint: □ No	:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	HIDGE			B. 6					
		JUDGE			DOCKET	NUMBER				
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil L.R. 3-2)  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)										
(1 lace all A III One Box On	<u>19)</u> — 📙 i	SAN FRANCISCO	J/UAKI	LAND & SA	NJUSE	□ EUREK	A			

DATE 04/23/2013

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Tammy Hussin